

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_126857
Title of the Manuscript:	Anthropometric Analysis of Cephalic Index in Orlu Population of Imo State Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The title okay, even though it has been done severally	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is adequate	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The conclusion of the abstract should reflect the predominant head type among males and females of the study population	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Table 3 shows that there was no significant difference in the head types among male and female. But the conclusion shows that there was significant difference between the head types among males and females. Please explain? Formula for determining sample size should be stated and referenced, not just mentioned. Which version of SPSS did you use. Abstract says 23, section 2.4.1 says 25	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is okay. However, there are minor corrections. Proper punctuations in the abstract. In the inclusion criteria, is it hand or head. Revisit the sentence construction in the exclusion criteria. Define every abbreviation (eg CI) in the first mention, then use abbreviation. Be consistent with terminologies. Eg if you are using 'subjects' use it all through, not participants, Vice versa. 'Indigen' (1 st line of result section) should be corrected.	
Optional/General comments	The work can be published	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chijioke Okeke
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria